

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/735,743	12/12/2000	Wei-min Liu	3298.1	7518
22886 7	590 02/18/2004		EXAMINER	
AFFYMETRIX, INC			ALLEN, MARIANNE P	
	TIP COUNSEL, LEGAL AL EXPRESSWAY	DEPT.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	RA, CA 95051		1631	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-
Advisory Action	09/735,743	LIU ET AL.	
ravicely riduen	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marianne P. Allen	1631	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		:- Ab - 61: Aib	dahawa ia lataa da
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The app originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>26 January 2004</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			orth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	IS.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	•	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,11-21,23-34,36-47,49-59,61-72</u>	2,74-85,87-97 and 99-103.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on 26 January 2004 is	a)⊠ approved or b)⊡ disapp	proved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	

Marianne P. Allen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1631

10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's amendments and comments are persuasive with respect to pages 4-5, 7, and 29 of the specification, Figure 6, and claims 14, 29, 52, 67, and 90 with respect to new matter. The new matter rejection of claim 103 is maintained. The language "more than 5000" is not synonymous with "at least." The enablement portion of the rejection is maintained for reasons of record. Applicant has not provided any explanation why it is within the skill of an ordinary artisan to develop additional suitable statistics without undue experimentation such that the method would be operable to determine presence or absence of a transcript. This is an unsupported statement. Claims 39 and 64 do not make clear that the components are integrated. Applicant has stated on page 23 of the response that this is the intent but the language of the claim does not make this clear. The art rejection is maintained for reasons o record.